



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,354	07/02/2001	Pekka Ketola	460-010421-US(PAR)	8266
2512	7590	10/20/2005	EXAMINER	
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			LIN, WEN TAI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/897,354

Applicant(s)

KETOLA, PEKKA

Examiner

Wen-Tai Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-15 and 17-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-15 and 17-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-15 and 17-23 are presented for examination.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, USC code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.
3. Claims 1, 3-4, 8-11, 15 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Picard et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 6233318].
4. Picard was cited in the previous office action.
5. As to claim 1, Picard teaches the invention as claimed including: a system for controlling by a terminal [e.g., 60, Fig.1 or 110, Fig.4] at least a first and a second remote mailbox [e.g., 115 and 120, Fig.4] located in at least one e-mail server [e.g., 106, 115, Fig.4], comprising means [e.g., 106, Fig.4] for arranging at least one simultaneous physical connection between the terminal and said e-mail server maintaining said first remote mailbox [note that the TCP/IP connection between 106 and 110 is based on a physical connection], and between the terminal and said e-mail server maintaining said second remote mailbox [note that the connections as illustrated in Figs. 1-4 are TCP/IP and PPP connections], and said terminal comprising means

[e.g., a browser] for controlling said remote mailboxes substantially simultaneously by means of said at least one physical connection [col.5, line 13 – col.6, line 23; col.13, lines 11-39; col.14, line 53 – col.16, line 44].

6. As to claim 3, Picard further teaches that an e-mail program [e.g., the browser] is arranged to be used for controlling said remote mailboxes, which e-mail program is provided with the capability to control several remote mailboxes [e.g., issuing a refresh request] substantially simultaneously, and in which each remote mailbox is provided with a unique identification, such as an icon or a name [col.13, lines 11-40; col.21, lines 24 – 34].

7. As to claim 4, Picard further teaches that a notification of an e-mail message that has arrived in one of said remote mailboxes is arranged to be produced for the user, characterized in that said notification is arranged to be provided with a unique identification of that remote mailbox to which the e-mail message has arrived [col.17, lines 8-15; col.20, lines 56-59; col.13, lines 11-21].

8. As to claims 8-11, 15 and 17-18, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1 and 3-4, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1 and 3-4 above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 5-6, 12-13, 19-20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Picard et al. (hereafter "Picard") [U.S. Pat. No. 6233318], as applied to claims 1-4, 8-11 and 15, 17-18 above.

11. As to claims 5-6, Picard further teaches that the user in the e-mail program is provided with the capability to formulate and send e-mail messages [col.3, lines 60-62; col.18, line 66 – col.19, line 25; Fig.11]. Picard does not specifically teach that the e-mail address of the user to be attached to the e-mail message to be transmitted is arranged to be selected in the e-mail program.

However, it is well known in the art to click the "reply" button for replying a message, wherein the original receiving mailbox's address is used as a sending mailbox. In a like manner, one would like to provide a sending mailbox's address that is consistent with an address that the recipient of the mail can be replied to. Since Picard's system integrates existing mailboxes of a subscriber and allow reception of mails from

Art Unit: 2154

non-subscribers (i.e., the non-subscribers only knows the address of a convention mailboxes), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the received mailbox as default sending address because by doing so it would make Picard's system transparent to the non-subscribers [col.8, lines 33-34 and 46- 67].

12. As to claims 12-13, 19-20 and 23, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-6, 8-11 and 15, 17-18, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-6, 8-11 and 15, 17-18 above.

As for the additional limitation requiring the terminal to use wireless communication in claim 23: it is noted that Picard teaches such a feature at col.4, lines 4-14.

13. Claims 14 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Picard et al.(hereafter "Picard") [U.S. Pat. No. 6233318], as applied to claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15, 17-20 above, further in view of AAPA [Applicant admitted prior art].

14. As to claims 14 and 21-22, Picard does not specifically teach that the system/method can be adopted in a GPRS system which contains means for establishing PDP connections. However, AAPA teaches that it is well known that a GPRS subscriber can have several different PDP connections, by which it facilitates the IP connections from a mobile device [col.2, lines 9-19].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have extended Picard's system to GPRS subscribers because AAPA teaches that GPRS system looks externally like an ordinary subnet of the Internet network and by expanding Picard's service to GPRS subscribers it would further broaden Picard's customer base.

15. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/28/2005 for claims 1, 3-6, 8-15 and 17-23 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Specifically, Applicant argues in the remarks that: (1) Pickard shows simultaneous TCP/IP connection to a VMS and an EMS, which requires two different physical hardware interfaces; (2) Pickard's mailboxes are not directly accessed by the user interface; (3) Pickard does not disclose or suggest forming more than one physical connection between a user device and different email servers; (4) With respect to claims 14 and 21-22, Applicant does not admit that a single application could have more than one PDP connection.

16. The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's remarks because:

1. As to points (1)-(4): Applicant is reminded that the language of claim 1, for example, requires at least one email server and at least one physical connection. For this reason, even if Picard's system only provides one email server with one physical connection between the terminal and the server it would still read on the claims.

2. As to point (1): Applicant is directed to Pickard's Fig.4, wherein 115 and 120 are two separate email servers, each containing a remote mailbox.

3. As to points (2) and (3): such features are not found in the claims.

4. As to point (4): The rejection of claims 14 and 21-22 only requires one PDP connection formed between the terminal and the Internet and such connection only serves as an extension from the conventional wired system to a wireless system, which is an obvious approach to an ordinary skill in the art.

For at least the above reasons, it is submitted that the prior art of record reads on the claims.

***Conclusion***

Examiner note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (571)272-3969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00) .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:


(703)872-9306 for official communications; and  
(571)273-3969 for status inquiries draft communication.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wen-Tai Lin

October 11, 2005

  
10/11/05